arXiv:1511.07306v1 [math.CO] 23 Nov 2015

RAMSEY NUMBERS OF TREES AND UNICYCLIC GRAPHS VERSUS FANS

MATTHEW BRENNAN

Abstract. The generalized Ramsey number $R(H, K)$ is the smallest positive integer n such that for any graph G with n vertices either G contains H as a subgraph or its complement $\overline{G}$ contains K as a subgraph. Let T_n be a tree with n vertices and F_m be a fan with $2m+1$ vertices consisting of m triangles sharing a common vertex. We prove a conjecture of Zhang, Broersma and Chen for $m \geq 9$ that $R(T_n, F_m) = 2n - 1$ for all $n \geq m^2 - m + 1$. Zhang, Broersma and Chen showed that $R(S_n, F_m) \geq 2n$ for $n \leq m^2 - m$ where S_n is a star on n vertices, implying that the lower bound we show is in some sense tight. We also extend this result to unicyclic graphs UC_n, which are connected graphs with n vertices and a single cycle. We prove that $R(UC_n, F_m) = 2n-1$ for all $n \geq m^2-m+1$ where $m \geq 18$. In proving this conjecture and extension, we present several methods for embedding trees in graphs, which may be of independent interest.

1. Introduction

Given two graphs H and K, the generalized Ramsey number $R(H, K)$ is the smallest positive integer n such that for any graph G with n vertices, either G contains H as a subgraph or the complement $\overline{G}$ of G contains K as a subgraph. When both H and K are complete graphs, $R(H, K)$ is the classical Ramsey number. Because classical Ramsey numbers are difficult to determine, Chvátal and Harary proposed to study generalized Ramsey numbers of graphs other than complete graphs through a series of papers in 1972 and 1973 [4, 5, 6].

Generalized Ramsey numbers have since been well studied for a variety of graphs, including trees and fans. Chvátal determined the Ramsey number of trees versus complete graphs, showing that $R(T_n, K_m) = (n-1)(m-1)+1$ for positive integers m and n [3]. Burr, Erdős, Faudree, Rousseau and Schelp determined the Ramsey number of large trees versus odd cycles, showing that $R(T_n, C_m) = 2n - 1$ for odd $m \geq 3$ and $n \geq 756m^{10}$ [2]. Salman and Broersma determined the Ramsey number of paths versus fans, finding $R(P_n, F_m)$ for various ranges of n and m [10]. Shi determined the Ramsey number of cycles versus fans, showing that $R(C_n, F_m) = 2n - 1$ for all $n > 3m$ [11]. In [8], Li and Rousseau proved an upper bound on the Ramsey number of fans versus complete graphs, showing

$$R(F_m, K_n) \leq (1 + o(1))\frac{n^2}{\log n}.$$

A survey of Ramsey numbers and related lower bounds can be found in [9].

There have also been general lower bounds shown to hold for Ramsey numbers. In 1981, Burr proved the following lower bound in terms of the chromatic number

Key words and phrases. Ramsey number, trees, fans, unicyclic.

$\chi(G)$ of a graph G and its chromatic surplus $s(G)$ – the minimum number of vertices in a color class over all proper vertex colorings of G using $\chi(G)$ colors.

Theorem 1 (Burr [1]). *If H is a connected graph with n vertices and $s(K)$ is the chromatic surplus of the graph K, then for $n \geq s(K)$ we have*

$$R(H, K) \geq (n-1)(\chi(K)-1) + s(K).$$

The Ramsey numbers of trees versus odd cycles, of cycles versus fans and of trees versus complete graphs determined by Burr *et al.*, Shi and Chvátal, respectively, achieve Burr's lower bound. Note that for a fan or odd cycle K, $\chi(K) = 3$ and $s(K) = 1$ and thus Theorem 1 implies that $R(T_n, F_m) \geq 2n-1$ for all m and $n \geq s(K) = 1$. This lower bound can be seen directly by considering the complete bipartite graph $K_{n-1,n-1}$. Since $\overline{K_{n-1,n-1}}$ is triangle-free, it does not contain F_m as a subgraph. Furthermore, $\overline{K_{n-1,n-1}}$ consists of two connected components of size $n-1$ and thus does not contain T_n as a subgraph.

In 2015, Zhang, Broersma and Chen showed that the lower bound from Theorem 1 is tight for large trees and stars versus fans, proving the following two theorems. Here, S_n denotes a star on n vertices consisting of an independent set of $n-1$ vertices all adjacent to a single vertex.

Theorem 2 (Zhang, Broersma, Chen [12]). *$R(T_n, F_m) = 2n-1$ for all integers m and $n \geq 3m^2 - 2m - 1$.*

Theorem 3 (Zhang, Broersma, Chen [12]). *$R(S_n, F_m) = 2n-1$ for all integers $n \geq m^2 - m + 1$ and $m \neq 3, 4, 5$, and this lower bound is the best possible. Moreover, $R(S_n, F_m) = 2n-1$ for $n \geq 6m-6$ and $m = 3, 4, 5$.*

Because it is generally believed that $R(T_n, G) \leq R(S_n, G)$ for any graph G, Zhang, Broersma and Chen made the following conjecture based on Theorem 3.

Conjecture 1 (Zhang, Broersma, Chen [12]). *$R(T_n, F_m) = 2n-1$ for all integers $m \geq 6$ and $n \geq m^2 - m + 1$.*

Theorem 3 yields that if $n \leq m^2 - m$ then $R(S_n, F_m) \geq 2n$, implying $n \geq m^2 - m + 1$ is the best achievable lower bound on n in terms of m over which $R(T_n, F_m) = 2n-1$ is true [12]. In this paper, we prove Conjecture 1 for the case $m \geq 9$. Specifically, we prove the following theorem.

Theorem 4. *$R(T_n, F_m) = 2n-1$ for all $n \geq m^2 - m + 1$ for $m \geq 9$.*

In [12], Zhang, Broersma and Chen also determined $R(T_n, K_{\ell-1} + mK_2)$ as a corollary of Theorem 2. Here, mG denotes the union of m vertex-disjoint copies of G and $G_1 + G_2$ is the graph obtained by joining every vertex of G_1 to every vertex of G_2 in $G_1 \cup G_2$. Zhang, Broersma and Chen identify $R(T_n, K_{\ell-1} + mK_2)$ for $n \geq 3m^2 - 2m - 1$ by induction on ℓ, using Theorem 2 as a base case. Their induction argument remains valid when Theorem 4 is used as the base case, yielding the following updated version of their corollary.

Corollary 1 (Zhang, Broersma, Chen [12]). *$R(T_n, K_{\ell-1} + mK_2) = \ell(n-1) + 1$ for $\ell \geq 2$ and $n \geq m^2 - m + 1$ where $m \geq 9$.*

We also extend Theorem 4 from trees to unicyclic graphs. Let UC_n denote a particular connected graph with n vertices and a single cycle – or equivalently a connected graph with n vertices and n edges. We prove the following result.

Theorem 5. *$R(UC_n, F_m) = 2n-1$ for all $n \geq m^2 - m + 1$ for $m \geq 18$.*

Note that Theorem 5 implies Theorem 4 as a corollary in the case $m \geq 18$. Despite this, we present our proofs of these two theorems separately because our approach to Theorem 4 motivates our proof of Theorem 5 and because we require a sufficiently different approach and more careful analysis to prove Theorem 4 for $9 \leq m < 18$. The next section provides the notation and key lemmas that will be used in the proofs of Theorem 4 and Theorem 5. In the two subsequent sections, we prove Theorem 4 and Theorem 5.

2. Preliminaries and Lemmas

We first provide the notation we will adopt on proving Theorem 4 and Theorem 5. Let G be any simple graph. Here, $d_X(v)$ denotes the degree of a vertex v in the set $X \subseteq V(G)$ in G and $\overline{d_X}(v)$ denotes the degree of v in X in the complement graph $\overline{G}$. Similarly, $N_X(v)$ and $\overline{N_X}(v)$ denote the sets of neighbors of v in the set X in G and $\overline{G}$, respectively. It is clear that $d_X(v)+\overline{d_X}(v) = |X|$ for any $X \subseteq V(G)$ not containing v and that $d_X(v) = |N_X(v)|$ and $\overline{d_X}(v) = |\overline{N_X}(v)|$. We also extend this notation to $N_X(Y)$ and $\overline{N_X}(Y)$ for sets $Y \subseteq V(G)$ disjoint from X. When the set X is omitted, it is implicitly $V(G)$ where the graph G is either clear from context or explicitly stated. We denote the maximum and minimum degrees of a graph G as $\Delta(G)$ and $\delta(G)$, respectively. When G is bipartite, we let the sets $A(G)$ and $B(G)$ denote the partite sets of G with $V(G) = A(G) \cup B(G)$ and $|A(G)| \geq |B(G)|$. In particular, this implies that $|A(G)| \geq |V(G)|/2$. For a tree T, we let $L(T)$ denote the set of leaves of T. Also note that if T is a tree then since T is bipartite, $A(T)$ and $B(T)$ are well-defined.

We now prove two lemmas that will be used throughout the proofs of Theorem 4 and Theorem 5. The first is a structural lemma concerning the vertices of degree two in trees and will be crucial to our methods for embedding trees.

Lemma 1. *Given a tree T and a subset $F \subseteq V(T)$, there is a set D satisfying:*

1. *$D \subseteq A(T)$ and $F \cap D = \emptyset$;*
2. *each $v \in D$ satisfies $d_T(v) = 2$;*
3. *each $v \in D$ is not adjacent to any leaves of T;*
4. *no two vertices in D have a common neighbor;*

and the size of D is at least

$$|D| \geq \frac{1}{4}\left(|V(T)| - 8|L(T)| - 2|F| + 12\right).$$

Proof. Since $|E(T)| = |V(T)| - 1$, it follows that

$$2|L(T)| + 2\left(|V(T)| - |L(T)|\right) - 2 = 2|E(T)| = \sum_{v \in V(T)} d_T(v) = |L(T)| + \sum_{v \in I} d_T(v)$$

where $I \subseteq V(T)$ is the set of internal vertices of T. Let $H \subseteq V(T)$ be the set of vertices $v \in V(T)$ with $d_T(v) \geq 3$. Rearranging yields that

$$2 + |H| \leq 2 + \sum_{v \in H} (d_T(v) - 2) = |L(T)|.$$

Therefore $|H| \leq |L(T)| - 2$ and it follows that

$$\sum_{v \in H} d_T(v) = 2|H| + |L(T)| - 2 \leq 3|L(T)| - 6.$$

Therefore H has at most $3|L(T)| - 6$ neighbors in T. Now note that for any $v \in V(T)$, either $A(T)$ contains v and none of the neighbors of v, or does not contain v. Since $d_T(v) \geq 1$ for all $v \in H$ and $v \in L(T)$, this observation implies the following two inequalities

$$|A(T) \cap (N_T(H) \cup H)| \leq \sum_{v \in H} d_T(v) \leq 3|L(T)| - 6$$
$$|A(T) \cap (N_T(L(T)) \cup L(T))| \leq |L(T)|.$$

Let $J \subseteq A(T)$ be the set of $v \in A(T)$ such that $d_T(v) = 2$, $v \notin F$ and v is not adjacent to any vertex in H or $L(T)$. Since $|A(T)| \geq |V(T)|/2$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} |J| &\geq |A(T)| - |F| - |A(T) \cap (N_T(H) \cup H)| - |A(T) \cap (N_T(L(T)) \cup L(T))| \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2}(|V(T)| - 8|L(T)| - 2|F| + 12). \end{aligned}$$

Now consider the graph K on the vertex set $V(K) = J$ such that for distinct $u, v \in J$, the edge $uv \in E(K)$ if and only if u and v have a common neighbor in T. Note that $uv \notin E(T)$ for all $u, v \in J$ since $J \subseteq A(T)$. Since no vertex of J is adjacent to a vertex of H, if $uv \in E(K)$ then the common neighbor of u and v in T is not adjacent to any vertices in J other than u and v. Therefore there cannot be a cycle in K since otherwise there would be a cycle in T, which is not possible since T is a tree. It follows that K is a forest and is bipartite. Let D be the larger part $A(K)$ in a bipartition of K. Defined in this way, D satisfies

$$|D| \geq \frac{1}{2}|J| \geq \frac{1}{4}\left(|V(T)| - 8|L(T)| - 2|F| + 12\right).$$

Also note that each $v \in D$ satisfies $d_T(v) = 2$, $v \notin F$ and v is not adjacent to a leaf of T since $D \subseteq J$ and no two vertices in D have a common neighbor in T since D is an independent set in K. □

In our proof of Theorem 4, we apply Lemma 1 always with $F = \emptyset$. In our proof of Theorem 5, F consists of two vertices that are adjacent along the cycle in the unicyclic graph UC_n. The next lemma asserts that there is always a vertex in any given tree that, when removed, leaves two disconnected sets of similar sizes.

Lemma 2. *Given a tree T with $|V(T)| \geq 3$, there is a vertex $v \in V(T)$ such that the vertices of the forest $T - v$ can be partitioned into two sets K and H such that there are no edges between K and H and*

$$\frac{1}{3}(|V(T)| - 1) \leq |K|, |H| \leq \frac{2}{3}(|V(T)| - 1).$$

Proof. First note that for any vertex $v \in V(T)$, the forest $T - v$ has $d_T(v)$ connected components. Consider the following procedure. Begin by setting v to be an arbitrary leaf of T. If $T - v$ has a connected component C of size at least $|V(T)|/2$, set v to its unique neighbor u in C. Note that $T - u$ has a connected component of size $|V(T)| - |C|$ and one or more connected components with the sum of their sizes equal to $|C| - 1$. Therefore either $|C| = |V(T)|/2$ or the size of the largest connected component decreases on setting v to u. Thus the procedure either leads to a vertex v such that $T - v$ has a connected component C of size $|C| = |V(T)|/2$ or terminates at a vertex v such that all connected components of $T - v$ have size strictly less than $|V(T)|/2$.

If v is such that $T-v$ has a connected component C of size $|C| = |V(T)|/2$, then let $K = C$ and $H = V(T-v) - C$. It follows that $|H| = |V(T)|/2 - 1$ and $|K| = |C| = |V(T)|/2$, which implies the desired result since in this case $|V(T)|$ must be even and thus $|V(T)| \geq 4$. Note that $d_T(v) = 1$ is not possible by the condition on v and $|V(T)| \geq 3$. If $d_T(v) = 2$, then $T - v$ consists of two connected components K and H such that $|K| + |H| = |V(T)| - 1$. Since $|K|, |H| < |V(T)|/2$, we have that $|K| = |H| = (|V(T)| - 1)/2$, in which case the result also holds.

If $d_T(v) = d \geq 3$, let the connected components of $T - v$ be $C_1, C_2, \ldots, C_d$. Note that in this case, we must have that $|V(T)| \geq 4$. Assume without loss of generality that $|C_1| \leq |C_2| \leq \cdots \leq |C_d| < |V(T)|/2$. Note that since $d \geq 3$ and $|C_1| + |C_2| + \cdots + |C_d| = |V(T)| - 1$, it follows that $|C_1| \leq (|V(T)| - 1)/3$. Now let t be the largest positive integer such that $|C_1| + |C_2| + \cdots + |C_t| \leq (|V(T)| - 1)/3$. Note that if $t = d-1$, then $|C_d| \geq 2(|V(T)|-1)/3$ which is not possible since $|C_d| < |V(T)|/2$. Therefore $t \leq d-2$. Note that $|C_1| + |C_2| + \cdots + |C_{t+1}| > (|V(T)| - 1)/3$ by definition. If $|C_1| + |C_2| + \cdots + |C_{t+1}| \leq 2(|V(T)| - 1)/3$, then letting

$$K = C_1 \cup C_2 \cup \cdots \cup C_{t+1} \quad \text{and} \quad H = C_{t+2} \cup C_{t+3} \cup \cdots \cup C_d$$

yields valid sets K and H. If $|C_1| + |C_2| + \cdots + |C_{t+1}| > 2(|V(T)| - 1)/3$, then it follows that $(|V(T)| - 1)/3 < |C_{t+1}| < |V(T)|/2 \leq 2(|V(T)| - 1)/3$ and letting

$$K = C_{t+1} \quad \text{and} \quad H = C_1 \cup \cdots \cup C_t \cup C_{t+2} \cup \cdots \cup C_d$$

yields the desired sets K and H, completing the proof of the lemma. □

The last two lemmas are stated without proof. Lemma 3 is a folklore lemma and Lemma 4 was proven by Zhang, Broersma and Chen and is Lemma 3 in [12].

Lemma 3 (Folklore)**.** *Let T be a tree with $w_1 \in V(T)$ and let H be a graph with $\delta(H) \geq |V(T)| - 1$ and $w_2 \in V(H)$. Then T can be embedded in H such that w_1 is mapped to w_2.*

Lemma 4 (Zhang, Broersma, Chen [12])**.** *$R(T_n, mK_2) = n + m - 1$ for $n \geq 4m - 4$ where mK_2 denotes a matching on m edges.*

3. Proof of Theorem 4

Let T_n denote a particular tree with n vertices. Assume for the sake of contradiction that there is a graph G with $2n - 1$ vertices that does not contain F_m as a subgraph and such that its complement $\overline{G}$ does not contain T_n as a subgraph. Our proof of Theorem 4 begins with a setup similar to that used by Zhang, Broersma and Chen in [12] to prove Theorem 2. In particular, Zhang, Broersma and Chen introduced the sets X_v, Y_v and U_v, used a weaker statement of Claim 3.1 and proved a stronger variant of Claim 3.4 that is not necessary for our approach. The remaining claims and final steps in our proof of Theorem 4 consist of several new methods to embed T_n in $\overline{G}$ that allow for a strengthened analysis and yield the desired quadratic lower bound on n in terms of m.

Our proof of Theorem 4 uses the following key ideas. First we prove Theorem 4 for all trees T_n containing some vertex adjacent to a large number of leaves. In the general case, we show that G must have enough structure in common with the extremal graph $K_{n-1,n-1}$ to yield a contradiction as follows. The lack of a fan F_m in G implies that the neighborhood of any vertex cannot contain an m-matching, which imposes a strong restriction on the structure of neighborhoods in

G and guarantees a large independent subset in any neighborhood. Attempting to greedily embed T_n in $\overline{G}$ twice yields that there are two large disjoint independent sets U_1 and U_2, which we prove together induce a large nearly-complete bipartite subgraph of G. Additional methods of embedding T_n in $\overline{G}$ guarantee that most of the edges are present between U_1 and U_2. Using the fact that G does not contain F_m, we have that each vertex in $W = V(G) - (U_1 \cup U_2)$ is adjacent to a small number of vertices in at least one of U_1 or U_2. From here we divide into the two cases in which T_n has many or few leaves, both of which lead to a contradiction. The case with many leaves is more easily handled and the case with few leaves is handled by examining the vertices of degree two in T_n using Lemma 1. We now begin our proof of Theorem 4.

Consider an arbitrary vertex $v \in V(G)$. Let $M_v \subseteq E(G)$ denote a maximum matching in $N(v)$ and let $t = |M_v|$. If $t \geq m$, then G contains an F_m on the vertices $V(M_v) \cup \{v\}$ and thus $t \leq m-1$. Let $U_v = N(v) - V(M_v)$. Note that no two vertices in U_v can be adjacent since this would allow M_v to be extended, contradicting its maximality. Now label the vertices in $V(M_v)$ as $x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_t, y_1, y_2, \ldots, y_t$ where $M_v = \{x_1y_1, x_2y_2, \ldots, x_ty_t\}$ and $d_{U_v}(x_i) \leq d_{U_v}(y_i)$ for all $1 \leq i \leq t$. If $d_{U_v}(y_i) \geq 2$ and $d_{U_v}(x_i) \geq 1$, then there are two distinct vertices $z, w \in U_v$ such that x_iz and y_iw are edges and $M_v \cup \{x_iz, y_iw\} - \{x_iy_i\}$ is a matching larger than M_v, which is a contradiction. Similarly, if $d_{U_v}(y_i) = d_{U_v}(x_i) = 1$, then x_i and y_i must be adjacent to the same vertex in U_v since otherwise M_v can again be extended. In summary, either $d_{U_v}(x_i) = d_{U_v}(y_i) = 1$ and x_i and y_i are adjacent to the same vertex in U_v or $d_{U_v}(x_i) = 0$.

Now assume without loss of generality that $d_{U_v}(y_i) \leq 1$ for $1 \leq i \leq k$ and $d_{U_v}(y_i) \geq 2$ for $k+1 \leq i \leq t$ where $0 \leq k \leq t$. Note that there are at most k vertices in U_v adjacent to vertices in $V(M_v) - \{y_{k+1}, \ldots, y_t\}$. Let Y_v be the union of $V(M_v) - \{y_{k+1}, \ldots, y_t\}$ and its set of neighbors in U_v and let $X_v = U_v - (U_v \cap Y_v)$. Now note that as defined above, we have

$$|U_v| = d(v) - 2t \geq d(v) - 2m + 2, \tag{3.1}$$

$$|X_v| \geq d(v) - 2t - k \geq d(v) - 3m + 3, \tag{3.2}$$

$$|Y_v| \leq t + 2k \leq 3m - 3, \tag{3.3}$$

$$|X_v| + |Y_v| = d(v) - t + k \geq d(v) - m + 1. \tag{3.4}$$

Note that if X_v, Y_v and U_v are replaced with $X_v \cap S$, $Y_v \cap S$ and $U_v \cap S$ for any set $S \subseteq V(G)$ and $d(v)$ is replaced with $d_S(v)$, then the lower bounds in terms of m shown above still hold by the same argument.

Let T be the largest subgraph of $\overline{G}$ that is an embedding of a subtree of T_n into $\overline{G}$. Since $\overline{G}$ does not contain T_n, it follows that $|V(T)| \leq n-1$ and that there is some $v \in V(T)$ such that v has no neighbors permitting T to be extended in $\overline{G}$. This requires that v is adjacent to all vertices in $V(G) - V(T)$. Since $|V(G) - V(T)| \geq 2n - 1 - (n-1) = n$, it follows that $d(v) \geq n$. This implies by the inequalities above that $|X_v \cup Y_v| \geq d(v) - m + 1 \geq n - m + 1$, $|U_v| \geq n - 2m + 2$ and $|X_v| \geq n - 3m + 3$ by inequalities (3.1)–(3.4) above.

If $|X_v| \geq n - m + 1$, let X_1 be a subset of X_v of size $n - m + 1$, let $Y_1 = \emptyset$ and let $U_1 = X_1 \subseteq X_v \subseteq U_v$. If $|X_v| < n - m + 1$ and $|U_v| \geq n - m + 1$, let $X_1 = X_v$, let U_1 be a subset of U_v containing X_1 such that $|U_1| = n - m + 1$, and let $Y_1 = U_1 - X_1$. If $|U_v| < n - m + 1$, let $X_1 = X_v$, let $U_1 = U_v$ and let Y_1 be a subset of Y_v containing $U_v \cap Y_v$ such that $|X_1 \cup Y_1| = n - m + 1$. This ensures that

$|X_1 \cup Y_1| = n - m + 1$, $|X_1| \geq n - 3m + 3$, $|U_1| \geq n - 2m + 2$, $|Y_1| \leq 3m - 3$ and $X_1 \subseteq X_v$, $Y_1 \subseteq Y_v$, $U_1 \subseteq U_v$, $X_1 \subseteq U_1$, $U_1 \subseteq X_1 \cup Y_1$ and $X_1 \cap Y_1 = \emptyset$. Note that since U_1 is an independent set, any embedding of a sub-forest of T_n of size at most $|U_1|$ to the subgraph of $\overline{G}$ induced by U_1 succeeds. Also note that each $v \in X_1$ is not adjacent to any vertex in $X_1 \cup Y_1$ other than itself.

The remainder of the proof of the theorem is divided into several claims. The first claim proves Theorem 4 for a class of trees. The proof of this claim is adapted from the beginning of the proof of Theorem 5 in [12].

Claim 3.1. *Each vertex $v \in V(T_n)$ is adjacent to at most $m-2$ leaves of T_n and $\Delta(T_n) < 11n/20$.*

Proof. We begin by showing that $\Delta(G) \leq n+m-2$. Assume for contradiction that $d(u) \geq n+m-1$ for some $u \in V(G)$. Since $m \geq 4$, it follows that $n \geq m^2-m+1 \geq 4m-4$ and by Lemma 4, either the subgraph of $\overline{G}$ induced by $N(u)$ contains T_n or the subgraph of G induced by $N(u)$ contains mK_2, which along with u yields F_m as a subgraph of G. This is a contradiction and thus $\Delta(G) \leq n + m - 2$.

Now we show that each vertex of T_n is adjacent to at most $m-2$ leaves. Assume for the sake of contradiction that some $v \in V(T_n)$ is adjacent to at least $m-1$ leaves. Let L be a set of $|L| = m-1$ leaves adjacent to v. Note that $T_n - L$ is a tree satisfying that

$$\delta(\overline{G}) \geq (2n-1) - 1 - \Delta(G) \geq n - m = |V(T_n - L)| - 1.$$

By Theorem 3, it follows that $\overline{G}$ contains S_n as a subgraph. Let w be the center of this S_n subgraph. By Lemma 3, $T_n - L$ can be embedded in $\overline{G}$ such that v is mapped to w. Since w is the center of an S_n subgraph of $\overline{G}$, it follows that $\overline{d}(w) \geq n-1$ and therefore including $|L| = m-1$ neighbors of w disjoint from the embedding of $T_n - L$ yields a successful embedding of T_n into $\overline{G}$. This is a contradiction and thus each vertex of T_n is adjacent to at most $m-2$ leaves.

We now show that $\Delta(T_n) < 11n/20$. Assume for the sake of contradiction that $\Delta(T_n) \geq 11n/20$ and let v be a vertex of largest degree in T_n. Let $K \subseteq L(T_n)$ be the set of leaves adjacent to v and let $H \subseteq V(T_n)$ be the set of vertices of degree at least two adjacent to v. It follows that $d_{T_n}(v) = |K| + |H|$. Because T_n contains v, each leaf in K, each vertex in H and at least $|H|$ distinct additional vertices each adjacent to a vertex of H, it follows that $n = |V(T_n)| \geq 1 + |K| + 2|H|$. Therefore

$$|K| + n \geq 1 + 2|K| + 2|H| = 1 + 2d_{T_n}(v) \geq 1 + 11n/10$$

which implies that $|K| \geq 1 + n/10 \geq m - 1$ since $n \geq m^2 - m + 1 \geq 10m - 20$ for $m \geq 9$. Applying the previous argument now yields a contradiction. □

The next claim guarantees embeddings of sub-forests of T_n to $X_1 \cup Y_1$, allowing some flexibility over where a set of vertices is mapped as long as not too many vertices in the set are in $A(T_n)$.

Claim 3.2. *Let $H \subseteq V(T_n)$ be such that $|V(T_n - H)| \leq |X_1| + |Y_1| = n - m + 1$ or, equivalently, such that $|H| \leq m-1$. Let $w_1, w_2, \ldots, w_k \in V(T_n - H)$ be distinct vertices of $T_n - H$ and let $u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_k \in X_1$ be distinct vertices of X_1. If*

$$|A(T_n) \cap \{w_1, w_2, \ldots, w_k\}| + |A(T_n) \cap H| \leq m + 1$$

then $T_n - H$ can be embedded in $\overline{G}$ such that the vertices of $T_n - H$ are mapped to a subset of $X_1 \cup Y_1$ and w_i is mapped to u_i for all $1 \leq i \leq k$.

Proof. Suppose that $|V(T_n - H)| = |X_1| + |Y_1| = n - m + 1$. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} |A(T_n) \cap V(T_n - H)| &= |A(T_n)| - |A(T_n) \cap H| \\ &\geq n/2 + |A(T_n) \cap \{w_1, w_2, \ldots, w_k\}| - m - 1 \\ &\geq 3m - 3 + |A(T_n) \cap \{w_1, w_2, \ldots, w_k\}| \\ &\geq |Y_1| + |A(T_n) \cap \{w_1, w_2, \ldots, w_k\}| \end{aligned}$$

since $n \geq m^2 - m + 1 \geq 8m - 4$ for all $m \geq 9$. Now embed the forest $T_n - H$ to $\overline{G}$ as follows. Map w_i to u_i for all $1 \leq i \leq k$ and map $|Y_1|$ vertices in $A(T_n) \cap V(T_n - H)$, excluding w_i if $w_i \in A(T_n)$ for all $1 \leq i \leq k$, to Y_1 arbitrarily, which is possible by the inequality above. Map the remaining $|X_1| - k$ vertices of $T_n - H$ arbitrarily to distinct vertices in $X_1 - \{u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_k\}$. Since each vertex in X_1 is adjacent to all vertices in $X_1 \cup Y_1$ in $\overline{G}$ other than itself and $A(T_n) \cap V(T_n - H)$ is an independent set of T_n, this embedding succeeds. If $|V(T_n - H)| < |X_1| + |Y_1|$, then the claim is also implied by this argument. □

The next claim begins the main body of the proof of Theorem 4. It is the first claim towards showing that G contains a large induced bipartite subgraph that is nearly complete.

Claim 3.3. *There is a vertex $u \in V(G)$ such that $d_{O_1}(u) \geq n$ where $O_1 = V(G) - (X_1 \cup Y_1)$.*

Proof. First note that T_n has a connected subtree K on $|X_1| + |Y_1| = n - m + 1$ vertices. Such a subtree can be obtained by removing a leaf of T_n and repeatedly removing a leaf of the resulting tree until $m - 1$ vertices have been removed. Now note that $|A(T_n) \cap V(T_n - K)| \leq |V(T_n - K)| = m - 1 < m + 1$. Thus by Claim 3.2 applied with $k = 0$, this subtree K can be embedded in $\overline{G}$ such that the vertices $V(K)$ are mapped exactly to $X_1 \cup Y_1$.

Now consider the following procedure to greedily extend this embedding to an embedding of T_n in $\overline{G}$. At any point in this procedure, let H denote the subgraph of $\overline{G}$ that has so far been embedded to. Note that $V(H) = X_1 \cup Y_1$ initially and $X_1 \cup Y_1 \subseteq V(H)$ at any point in this procedure. Greedily extend the embedding as follows: if $u_1 \in V(T_n)$ has been mapped to $u_2 \in V(H) \subseteq V(G)$, $w \in V(T_n)$ has not been embedded to $\overline{G}$ and w is adjacent to u_1 in T_n, map w to some element of $\overline{N_{V(G)-V(H)}}(u_2)$ if it is non-empty. Note that each possible w has a unique neighbor among the vertices $V(T_n)$ that have been embedded to H since T_n contains no cycles and H is always connected throughout this procedure. Furthermore, if not all of T_n has been embedded to $\overline{G}$ then some such $w \in V(T_n)$ must exist since T_n is connected. Since $\overline{G}$ does not contain T_n as a subgraph, the embedding must fail with $\overline{N_{V(G)-V(H)}}(u_2) = \emptyset$ for some $u_2 \in V(H)$ where $|V(H)| \leq n - 1$. Since $V(G) - V(H) \subseteq O_1$, this implies that $d_{O_1}(u_2) \geq d_{V(G)-V(H)}(u_2) \geq |V(G) - V(H)| \geq n$, completing the proof of the claim. □

We now construct sets X_2, Y_2 and U_2 similarly to X_1, Y_1 and U_1. Since $d_{O_1}(u) \geq n$, it follows that $|O_1 \cap (X_u \cup Y_u)| \geq d_{O_1}(u) - m + 1 \geq n - m + 1$ and $|O_1 \cap U_u| \geq n - 2m + 2$ by applying the lower bounds (3.1)–(3.4) restricted to the subset $S = O_1$. If $|O_1 \cap X_u| \geq n - m + 1$, let X_2 be a subset of $O_1 \cap X_u$ of size $n - m + 1$, let $Y_2 = \emptyset$ and let $U_2 = X_2 \subseteq O_1 \cap X_u \subseteq O_1 \cap U_u$. If $|O_1 \cap X_u| < n - m + 1$ and $|O_1 \cap U_u| \geq n - m + 1$, let $X_2 = O_1 \cap X_u$, let U_2 be a subset of $O_1 \cap U_u$ containing X_2 such that $|U_2| = n - m + 1$ and let $Y_2 = U_2 - X_2$. If $|O_1 \cap U_u| < n - m + 1$,

let $X_2 = O_1 \cap X_u$, let $U_2 = O_1 \cap U_u$ and let Y_2 be a subset of $O_1 \cap Y_u$ containing $O_1 \cap U_u \cap Y_u$ such that $|X_2 \cup Y_2| = n-m+1$. Applying the lower bounds (3.1)–(3.4) restricted to the subset $S = O_1$ yields that $|X_2 \cup Y_2| = n-m+1$, $|X_2| \geq n-3m+3$, $|U_2| \geq n-2m+2$ and $|Y_2| \leq 3m-3$. Furthermore, we have that $X_2 \subseteq O_1 \cap X_u$, $Y_2 \subseteq O_1 \cap Y_u$, $U_2 \subseteq O_1 \cap U_u$, $X_2 \subseteq U_2$ and $U_2 \subseteq X_2 \cup Y_2$. Also note that X_1, X_2, Y_1 and Y_2 are pairwise disjoint and that Claim 3.2 holds when X_1 and Y_1 are replaced with X_2 and Y_2, respectively.

We now proceed to the fourth claim in our proof of Theorem 4, which shows that each vertex in U_1 is adjacent to almost all vertices in U_2, and thus that U_1 and U_2 induce a nearly complete bipartite subgraph of G.

Claim 3.4. *For each $w \in U_1$, we have $\overline{d_{U_2}}(w) \leq 2m-3$, and for each $w \in U_2$, we have $\overline{d_{U_1}}(w) \leq 2m-3$.*

Proof. Assume for contradiction that for some $w \in U_1$, it holds that $\overline{d_{U_2}}(w) \geq 2m-2$. By Lemma 2, there is a vertex x of T_n such that $V(T_n - x)$ can be partitioned into two sets K and H such that there are no edges between K and H and $(n-1)/3 \leq |K|, |H| \leq 2(n-1)/3$. Note that K and H are both sub-forests of T_n. Let the connected components of K be $C_1, C_2, \ldots, C_d$ where $|C_1| \leq |C_2| \leq \cdots \leq |C_d|$. Let p be the minimum positive integer such that $|C_1|+|C_2|+\cdots+|C_p| \geq 2m-2$ and let $C = C_1 \cup C_2 \cup \cdots \cup C_p$. Note that p exists since $|C_1| + |C_2| + \cdots + |C_d| = |K| \geq (n-1)/3 \geq (m^2-m)/3 \geq 2m-2$ for $m \geq 6$. Since $|C_i| \geq 1$ for all $1 \leq i \leq d$, it follows that $p \leq 2m-2$ and since $C \subseteq K$ it follows that $|C| \leq |K| \leq 2(n-1)/3$.

We have that $T_n - C$ is a tree since C is a union of connected components of $T_n - x$ and $x \in V(T_n - C)$. Also note that $|V(T_n - C)| = n - |C| \leq n - 2m + 2 \leq |U_1|$. Now consider the following embedding of T_n into $\overline{G}$. Map x to w and the remaining $|V(T_n - C)| - 1 \leq |U_1| - 1$ vertices of $T_n - C$ arbitrarily to distinct vertices in $U_1 - \{w\}$. Now let $v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_p$ be the unique vertices adjacent to x in $C_1, C_2, \ldots, C_p$, respectively, in T_n. Map $v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_p$ to $p \leq 2m-2$ distinct neighbors of w in U_2 in $\overline{G}$. Map $C - \{v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_p\}$ arbitrarily to distinct vertices in U_2 that have not already been mapped to. Note this is possible since $|C| \leq 2(n-1)/3 \leq n - 2m + 2 \leq |U_2|$ is implied by $n \geq m^2 - m + 1 \geq 6m - 8$ for $m \geq 6$. Since U_1 and U_2 are complete subgraphs of $\overline{G}$, this embedding succeeds and contradicts the fact that T_n is not a subgraph of $\overline{G}$. The same argument as above shows that for each $w \in U_2$, it holds that $\overline{d_{U_1}}(w) \leq 2m-3$. □

Let $Z = V(G) - (X_1 \cup Y_1 \cup X_2 \cup Y_2)$ and note that $|Z| = 2n-1-2(n-m+1) = 2m-3$. Also let $W = V(G) - (U_1 \cup U_2)$ and note that $W \subseteq Z$. We now prove the fifth and sixth claims in our proof of Theorem 4. Claim 3.5 is an intermediary step towards showing Claim 3.6, which guarantees that each vertex $w \in W$ has few neighbors in at least one of U_1 or U_2 and provides a natural way to associate each such w with one of the two sets.

Claim 3.5. *For each $w \in W$, either $\overline{d_{U_1}}(w) < 11n/40$ or $\overline{d_{U_2}}(w) < 11n/40$.*

Proof. Assume for contradiction that some $w \in W$ satisfies that $\overline{d_{U_1}}(w) \geq 11n/40$ and $\overline{d_{U_2}}(w) \geq 11n/40$. By Lemma 2, there is a vertex x of T_n such that $V(T_n - x)$ can be partitioned into two sets K and H such that there are no edges between K and H and $(n-1)/3 \leq |K|, |H| \leq 2(n-1)/3$.

Now suppose that $d_K(x) \leq \overline{d_{U_1}}(w)$ and $d_H(x) \leq \overline{d_{U_2}}(w)$. Consider the following embedding of T_n to $\overline{G}$. Map x to w, map $N_K(x)$ to $d_K(x)$ distinct vertices in

$\overline{N_{U_1}}(w)$ and map $N_H(x)$ to $d_H(x)$ distinct vertices in $\overline{N_{U_2}}(w)$. Map the remaining vertices of K to $|K| - d_K(x)$ distinct vertices in U_1 that have not been embedded to and map the remaining vertices of H to $|H| - d_H(x)$ distinct vertices of U_2 that have not been embedded to. Note this is possible since $|K|, |H| \leq 2(n-1)/3 \leq n - 2m + 2 \leq |U_1|, |U_2|$ is implied by $n \geq m^2 - m + 1 \geq 6m - 8$ for $m \geq 6$. This yields a successful embedding of T_n to $\overline{G}$, which is a contradiction.

Therefore either $d_K(x) > \overline{d_{U_1}}(w) \geq 11n/40$ or $d_H(x) > \overline{d_{U_2}}(w) \geq 11n/40$. Without loss of generality, assume that $d_K(x) > \overline{d_{U_1}}(w) \geq 11n/40$. Note that K is the union of $d_K(x)$ connected components of $T_n - x$. Let C be the union of $d_K(x) - \overline{d_{U_1}}(w)$ of these connected components. Let $K' = K - C$ and $H' = H \cup C$. Note that $d_{K'}(x) = \overline{d_{U_1}}(w)$ and that

$$d_{H'}(x) = d_{T_n}(x) - d_{K'}(x) \leq \Delta(T_n) - \overline{d_{U_1}}(w) < 11n/40 \leq \overline{d_{U_2}}(w)$$

where $\Delta(T_n) < 11n/20$ by Claim 3.1. It follows that $|K'| \geq d_{K'}(x) = \overline{d_{U_1}}(w) \geq 11n/40 \geq 2m - 2$ since $n \geq m^2 - m + 1 \geq 80(m-1)/11$ for $m \geq 8$. This implies that $|H'| = n - 1 - |K'| \leq n - 2m + 1 < |U_2|$. Furthermore $|K'| \leq |K| \leq |U_1|$. Now applying the embedding described in the previous case to K' and H' in place of K and H yields the same contradiction. □

Claim 3.6. *For each $w \in W$, either $d_{U_1}(w) \leq m - 1$ or $d_{U_2}(w) \leq m - 1$.*

Proof. By Claim 3.5, either $\overline{d_{U_1}}(w) < 11n/40$ or $\overline{d_{U_2}}(w) < 11n/40$ for each $w \in W$. Given some $w \in W$, suppose that $\overline{d_{U_2}}(w) < 11n/40$ and assume for contradiction that $d_{U_1}(w) \geq m$. Let $S = N_{U_2}(w)$ be the set of neighbors of w in U_2. Note that since $\overline{d_{U_2}}(w) < 11n/40$, it follows that $|S| = d_{U_2}(w) > |U_2| - 11n/40 \geq 29n/40 - 2m + 2$. By Claim 3.4, each $x \in N_{U_1}(w) \subseteq U_1$ satisfies that $\overline{d_{U_2}}(x) \leq 2m - 3$. This implies that for each $x \in N_{U_1}(w)$, we have that $d_S(x) \geq |S| - \overline{d_{U_2}}(x) \geq 29n/40 - 4m + 5 \geq m$ since $n \geq m^2 - m + 1 \geq 200(m-1)/29$ for $m \geq 7$. This implies that there is a matching with m edges between $N_{U_1}(w)$ and S. With the vertex w, this matching yields that G contains F_m as a subgraph, which is a contradiction. By the same argument, if $\overline{d_{U_1}}(w) < 11n/40$ then it must follow that $d_{U_2}(w) \leq m - 1$. □

In the remainder of the proof, we divide into the two cases in which T_n has many and few leaves, both of which lead to a contradiction. Since $|Z| = 2m - 3$, Claim 3.6 implies that either at least $m - 1$ vertices $w \in Z$ satisfy that $d_{U_1}(w) \leq m - 1$ or at least $m - 1$ vertices $w \in Z$ satisfy that $d_{U_2}(w) \leq m - 1$. Without loss of generality, assume that there is a set Z_1 such that $|Z_1| = m - 1$ and each $w \in Z_1$ satisfies that $d_{U_1}(w) \leq m - 1$. Let $Z_1 = \{z_1, z_2, \ldots, z_{m-1}\}$. We now consider the following two cases.

Case 1. $|L(T_n)| \geq m + 1$.

We claim there is a set D consisting of $|D| = m - 1$ leaves chosen such that $d \leq m - 4$ where d is the maximum value $d_D(x)$ over all $x \in V(T_n) - D$. We choose the set D as follows. Let $y \in V(T_n) - L(T_n)$ be such that $d_{L(T_n)}(y)$ is maximized. By Claim 3.1, it follows that $d_{L(T_n)}(y) \leq m - 2$. If $d_{L(T_n)}(y) \leq m - 4$, then any choice of $m - 1$ leaves forms a valid set D. Otherwise, let D consist of $m - 4$ leaves adjacent to y and three leaves not adjacent to y. Note that this is possible since $|L(T_n) - N_{L(T_n)}(y)| \geq m + 1 - (m - 2) = 3$. Since $m \geq 7$ and $L(T_n)$ is an independent set, this choice of D ensures that $d \leq m - 4$, verifying our claim.

Now let $D = \{d_1, d_2, \ldots, d_{m-1}\}$ and let $N_{T_n}(D) = \{y_1, y_2, \ldots, y_k\}$ where $k = |N_{T_n}(D)|$. Note that $d_D(y_i) \leq d$ for all $1 \leq i \leq d$ and there is some i such that $d_D(y_i) = d$. Since each d_i is adjacent to exactly one y_i, it follows that $k \leq m-1$. Consider the following embedding of T_n to $\overline{G}$. Begin by mapping d_i to z_i for all $1 \leq i \leq m-1$. For each $1 \leq i \leq k$, let N_i be the subset of Z_1 that $N_D(y_i)$ is embedded to, or in other words the set of all z_j such that $d_j \in N_D(y_i)$. Note that $|N_i| \leq d$ for each $1 \leq i \leq k$. By Claim 3.6, each z_i is not adjacent to at most $m-1$ vertices of $X_1 \subseteq U_1$ in $\overline{G}$. Thus the number of vertices in X_1 adjacent to all vertices in N_i in $\overline{G}$ is at least

$$\begin{aligned} |X_1| - |N_i| \cdot (m-1) &\geq n - 3m + 3 - d(m-1) \\ &\geq m^2 - 4m + 4 - d(m-1) \\ &= (m-3-d)(m-1) + 1 \\ &> m - 1 \geq k \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from $d \leq m-4$. Therefore greedily selecting k vertices $u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_k$ such that u_i is adjacent to all vertices in N_i in $\overline{G}$ and $u_i \in X_1$ for all $1 \leq i \leq k$ succeeds. Now note that for each $1 \leq i \leq k$, either $y_i \in A(T_n)$ and no vertices of $N_D(y_i)$ are in $A(T_n)$ or $y_i \notin A(T_n)$. This implies that since $|N_D(y_i)| = |N_i| \geq 1$ for each i,

$$\begin{aligned} |A(T_n) \cap \{y_1, y_2, \ldots, y_k\}| + |A(T_n) \cap D| &\leq |N_1| + |N_2| + \cdots + |N_k| \\ &= |D| = m - 1. \end{aligned}$$

By Claim 3.2, since $|V(T_n - D)| = n - m + 1 = |X_1| + |Y_1|$, the forest $T_n - D$ can be embedded to $X_1 \cup Y_1$ in $\overline{G}$ such that y_i is mapped to u_i for all $1 \leq i \leq k$. This yields a successful embedding of T_n to $\overline{G}$, which is a contradiction.

Case 2. $|L(T_n)| \leq m$.

By Lemma 1, there is a subset $K \subseteq A(T_n)$ such that each $w \in K$ satisfies $d_{T_n}(w) = 2$ and w is not adjacent to any leaves of T_n, no two vertices in K have a common neighbor, and

$$|K| \geq \frac{1}{4}\left(n - 8|L(T_n)| + 12\right).$$

Now note that

$$|K| + |L(T_n)| \geq \frac{1}{4}\left(n - 4m + 12\right) \geq m + 3$$

since $n \geq m^2 - m + 1 \geq 8m$ for $m \geq 9$. We now claim that there is a set $D \subseteq K \cup L(T_n)$ such that $|D| = m-1$ and $d \leq m-5$ where d is the maximum value $d_D(x)$ over all $x \in V(T_n) - D$. We choose the set D as follows. Note that because $|L(T_n)| \leq m$ and $|K| + |L(T_n)| \geq m+3$, it follows that $|K| \geq 3$. Select $\min\{|K|, m-1\} \geq 3$ vertices in K to be in D. Let $y \in V(T_n) - (K \cup L(T_n))$ be such that $d_{L(T_n)}(y)$ is maximized. If $|K| < m-1$ and $d_{L(T_n)}(y) \leq m-6$, then add any $m-1-|K|$ leaves to D. If $|K| < m-1$ and $d_{L(T_n)}(y) \geq m-5$, then add $m-6$ leaves adjacent to y to D and $5-|K|$ leaves not adjacent to y to D. Note that this yields that $|D| = |K| + m - 6 + 5 - |K| = m-1$. Because $|L(T_n)| \geq m$ and y is adjacent to at most $m-2$ leaves by Claim 3.1, there are some two leaves not adjacent to y. Note that since $|K| \geq 3$, it follows that $5 - |K| \leq 2$ and thus the described selection is possible. Since $2 \leq m-6$, this construction ensures that each vertex not in $K \cup L(T_n)$ is adjacent to at most $m-6$ leaves in D. Combining

this with the fact that $K \cup L(T_n)$ is an independent set and each vertex of T_n is adjacent to at most one vertex in K yields that $d \leq m-5$, verifying our claim.

As in Case 1, let $D = \{d_1, d_2, \ldots, d_{m-1}\}$ and let $N_{T_n}(D) = \{y_1, y_2, \ldots, y_k\}$ where $k = |N_{T_n}(D)|$. Define N_i as in Case 1 and note again that $|N_i| \leq d$ for each $1 \leq i \leq k$. Also note that since each vertex in D has degree at most two, it follows that $k \leq 2m-2$. As before, the number of vertices in X_1 adjacent to all vertices in N_i in $\overline{G}$ is at least

$$|X_1| - |N_i| \cdot (m-1) \geq (m-3-d)(m-1) + 1 > 2m-2 \geq k,$$

since $d \leq m-5$. Therefore, it again follows that greedily selecting k vertices $u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_k$ such that u_i is adjacent to all vertices in N_i in $\overline{G}$ and $u_i \in X_1$ for all $1 \leq i \leq k$ succeeds. Now note that since $K \subseteq A(T_n)$, it follows that the neighbors of vertices in $K \cap D$ are in $B(T_n)$. Thus $A(T_n) \cap \{y_1, y_2, \ldots, y_k\}$ includes only neighbors of leaves in $L(T_n) \cap D$. By the same reasoning as in the previous case, we have that

$$|A(T_n) \cap \{y_1, y_2, \ldots, y_k\}| + |A(T_n) \cap L(T_n) \cap D| \leq |L(T_n) \cap D|.$$

Now it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} &|A(T_n) \cap \{y_1, y_2, \ldots, y_k\}| + |A(T_n) \cap D| \\ &\quad = |A(T_n) \cap \{y_1, y_2, \ldots, y_k\}| + |A(T_n) \cap L(T_n) \cap D| + |K \cap D| \\ &\quad \leq |L(T_n) \cap D| + |K \cap D| = |D| = m-1. \end{aligned}$$

By Claim 3.2, since $|V(T_n - D)| = n - m + 1 = |X_1| + |Y_1|$, the forest $T_n - D$ can be embedded to $X_1 \cup Y_1$ in $\overline{G}$ such that y_i is mapped to u_i for all $1 \leq i \leq k$. This yields a successful embedding of T_n to $\overline{G}$, which is a contradiction. This completes the proof of Theorem 4.

4. Proof of Theorem 5

Let UC_n be a particular connected graph on n vertices containing a single cycle $c(UC_n)$ and let G be a graph with $2n-1$ vertices. Assume for the sake of contradiction that G does not contain F_m as a subgraph and $\overline{G}$ does not contain UC_n as a subgraph. Our proof of Theorem 5 follows a sequence of claims similar to those used to prove Theorem 4. We begin by showing the existence of the sets X_i, Y_i and U_i for $i = 1, 2$ but require a more involved approach than in Theorem 4. From this point forward, we construct embeddings of the tree formed by eliminating an edge t_1t_2 on $c(UC_n)$ to $\overline{G}$ while paying close attention to the images of t_1 and t_2 to ensure that these two vertices are joined by an edge in $\overline{G}$. We prove Theorem 5 in the case when T_n contains a vertex adjacent to many leaves, again requiring a different method from that used to prove the corresponding claim in Theorem 4. The proof of Theorem 5 then follows a very similar structure to that of Theorem 4 with additional attention required for t_1 and t_2. Where details are similar, we refer to parts of the proof of Theorem 4. We now begin our proof of Theorem 5.

As proven by Shi in [11], $R(C_n, F_m) = 2n-1$ for all $n > 3m$. Therefore we may assume that UC_n is not the cycle C_n. If UC_n is not a cycle, there must be an edge t_1t_2 of $c(UC_n)$ such that removing the edge t_1t_2 yields a tree in which t_1 is not a leaf. Let T_n be the tree formed on removing the edge t_1t_2 from UC_n. As in the proof of Theorem 4, define the sets U_v, X_v and Y_v for any $v \in V(G)$. Since G does not contain F_m as a subgraph, the same inequalities (3.1)–(3.4) on

the sizes $|U_v|, |X_v|$ and $|Y_v|$ as in the proof of Theorem 4 hold here. In the proof of Theorem 5, we often explicitly exclude t_2 from sets of leaves even though this is only necessary in the case that t_2 is a leaf of T_n.

Our first two claims show the existence of analogues of the sets X_1, Y_1 and U_1 from our proof of Theorem 4. The first claim we prove implicitly involves the fact that any graph H satisfying $\delta(H) \geq |V(H)|/2$ is pancyclic – contains a cycle of every length between 3 and $|V(H)|$, inclusive. We prove this fact using an argument of Droogendijk [7].

Claim 4.1. *We have that $\Delta(G) \geq n$.*

Proof. Assume for contradiction that $\Delta(G) \leq n-1$. We will consider the two cases in which $\Delta(G) \leq n-2$ and $\Delta(G) = n-1$, separately. We first consider the case wherein $\Delta(G) \leq n-2$, which implies that $\delta(\overline{G}) \geq |V(G)| - 1 - (n-2) = n$. Let $v \in V(G)$ be an arbitrary vertex and consider the graph $\overline{G} - v$. Now note that $\delta(\overline{G} - v) \geq n - 1 = |V(\overline{G} - v)|/2$, which implies by Dirac's Theorem that $\overline{G} - v$ has a Hamiltonian cycle. Let $u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_{2n-2}$ be the vertices of $\overline{G} - v$ ordered along this Hamiltonian cycle and let $k = |c(UC_n)|$. Since v is adjacent in $\overline{G}$ to at least n vertices in $\overline{G} - v$, it must be adjacent to some two of the form u_i and u_{i+k-2} where indices are taken modulo $2n-2$. The vertices $v, u_i, u_{i+1}, \ldots, u_{i+k-2}$ now form a cycle C of length $k = |c(UC_n)|$.

Consider the following procedure to embed UC_n to $\overline{G}$. Begin by mapping the cycle $c(UC_n)$ to C arbitrarily. At any point in this procedure, let H denote the subgraph of $\overline{G}$ that has so far been embedded to. Note that $H = C$ initially and $C \subseteq H$ always in this procedure. Greedily extend the embedding as follows: if $u_1 \in V(UC_n)$ has been mapped to $u_2 \in V(H) \subseteq V(G)$, $w \in V(UC_n)$ has not been embedded to $\overline{G}$ and w is adjacent to u_1 in UC_n, map w to some element of $\overline{N}_{V(G)-V(H)}(u_2)$ if it is non-empty. Note that each possible w has a unique neighbor among the vertices of $V(UC_n)$ that have been embedded to H because the unique cycle of UC_n is $c(UC_n)$, which at the start of the procedure has already been embedded to H. Furthermore, if not all of UC_n has been embedded to $\overline{G}$ then some such $w \in V(UC_n)$ must exist since each vertex of UC_n is connected in $UC_n - E(c(UC_n))$ to a vertex in $c(UC_n)$, which begins embedded to H. Since $\overline{G}$ does not contain UC_n as a subgraph, the embedding must fail with $\overline{N_{V(G)-V(H)}}(u_2) = \emptyset$ for some $u_2 \in V(H)$ where $|V(H)| \leq n-1$. This implies that $d(u_2) \geq |V(G) - V(H)| \geq n$, which contradicts $\Delta(G) \leq n-2$.

Now consider the case in which $\Delta(G) = n-1$. Let $u \in V(G)$ be such that $d(u) = n-1$ and note that $|U_u| \geq d(u) - 2m + 2 = n - 2m + 1$. We now show that $\overline{G}$ contains a cycle C_k of length $k = |c(UC_n)|$. Consider the case $k > n - 2m + 1$. As proven by Shi in [11], $R(C_\ell, F_m) = 2\ell - 1$ for $\ell > 3m$. Since $2k - 1 \leq 2n - 1 = |V(G)|$, $k > n - 2m + 1 \geq 3m$ and G does not contain F_m, it follows that $\overline{G}$ contains C_k as a subgraph. If $k \leq n - 2m + 1$, then U_u is a complete graph in $\overline{G}$ of size at least k and thus contains C_k.

Now apply the same embedding procedure as used in the previous case to embed UC_n to $\overline{G}$, beginning by mapping $c(UC_n)$ to the C_k subgraph of $\overline{G}$. Since $\overline{G}$ does not contain UC_n as a subgraph, this yields that $d(u_2) \geq n$ for some $u_2 \in V(G)$ as in the previous case, contradicting $\Delta(G) = n - 1$ and proving the claim. □

Let $v \in V(G)$ be a vertex satisfying $d(v) \geq n$, which exists by Claim 4.1. Now define X_1, Y_1 and U_1 as in the proof of Theorem 4. We next prove two claims that

show the existence of X_2, Y_2 and U_2, the second of which resembles Claim 3.3 in the proof of Theorem 4. However, a more involved proof accounting for UC_n will be needed. We remark that this proof also implies Claim 3.3 in the proof of Theorem 4. In order to provide a simpler proof of Theorem 4, we did not use this argument for Claim 3.3. Let $O_1 = V(G) - (X_1 \cup Y_1)$.

Claim 4.2. *Suppose it holds that $\overline{d_{O_1}}(u) \geq m-1$ for all $u \in X_1 \cup Y_1$. Let $K \subseteq X_1 \cup Y_1$ and $H \subseteq O_1$ be such that $|H| \geq n+1$ and $2|K| \geq |H|+1$. Then there exists three distinct vertices x, y, z with $x, z \in K$ and $y \in H$ such that y is adjacent to x and z in $\overline{G}$.*

Proof. Assume for contradiction that no such x, y and z exist. It follows that each $x \in H$ is adjacent to at most one vertex of K in $\overline{G}$ and therefore that the number of edges between K and H in $\overline{G}$ is at most $|H|$. Note that for each $y \in K \subseteq X_1 \cup Y_1$,

$$\overline{d_H}(y) \geq \overline{d_{O_1}}(y) - |O_1 - H| \geq m - 1 - (n + m - 2 - (n+1)) = 2.$$

The number of edges between K and H in $\overline{G}$ is therefore at least $2|K| \geq |H|+1$, which is a contradiction. □

Claim 4.3. *There is a vertex $u \in X_1 \cup Y_1$ such that $d_{O_1}(u) \geq n$.*

Proof. Assume for contradiction that $d_{O_1}(u) \leq n-1$ for all $u \in X_1 \cup Y_1$. Note that $|O_1| = 2n - 1 - |X_1 \cup Y_1| = n + m - 2$. Thus for all $u \in X_1 \cup Y_1$,

$$\overline{d_{O_1}}(u) = |O_1| - d_{O_1}(u) \geq n + m - 2 - (n-1) = m - 1.$$

If T_n has at least m leaves then let $L \subseteq L(T_n)$ be a set of $|L| = m-1$ of these leaves such that $t_2 \notin L$, and let $x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_k$ be the vertices adjacent to L in T_n. Let $L = L_1 \cup L_2 \cup \cdots \cup L_k$ where L_i consists of the leaves in L adjacent to x_i for each $1 \leq i \leq k$. Consider the following embedding of T_n into $\overline{G}$. By Claim 3.2, the tree $T_n - L$ on $n - m + 1 = |X_1| + |Y_1|$ vertices can be embedded into $\overline{G}$ such that t_1 and t_2 are mapped to vertices in X_1. Now let $v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_k \in X_1 \cup Y_1$ denote the vertices that $x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_k \in V(T_n - L)$ were embedded to. Now greedily select $|L_i|$ distinct neighbors of v_i in O_1 in $\overline{G}$ that have not been selected by any v_j where $j < i$ to embed the vertices of L_i to for $1 \leq i \leq k$. This is possible since $|L_1| + |L_2| + \cdots + |L_k| = m-1$ and $\overline{d_{O_1}}(v_i) \geq m-1$ for $1 \leq i \leq k$, yielding a successful embedding of T_n into $\overline{G}$. Now note that since t_1 and t_2 were embedded to X_1, which is a complete graph in $\overline{G}$, it follows that $\overline{G}$ contains UC_n as a subgraph, which is a contradiction. Therefore T_n must have at most $m-1$ leaves.

By Lemma 1, if $F = \{t_1, t_2\}$ then there is a subset $D \subseteq A(T_n)$ such that $F \cap D = \emptyset$, each $v \in D$ satisfies that $d_{T_n}(v) = 2$ and v is not adjacent to a leaf of T_n, no two vertices in D have a common neighbor in T_n, and $|D| \geq (n - 8|L(T_n)| + 8)/4$ where $|L(T_n)| \leq m-1$ is the number of leaves of T_n. Let $L = L(T_n) - F \cap L(T_n)$ where either $F \cap L(T_n) = \{t_2\}$ or $F \cap L(T_n) = \emptyset$. Since T_n has at least two leaves when $n \geq 2$, it follows that $|L(T_n)| \geq 2$ and $|L| \geq 1$. Because $n \geq m^2 - m + 1 \geq 8m - 12$ for $m \geq 8$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |L| + |D| &\geq |L(T_n)| - 1 + (n - 8|L(T_n)| + 8)/4 \\ &\geq (n - 4m + 8)/4 \geq m - 1. \end{aligned}$$

Let $d_1, d_2, \ldots, d_k$ be k elements of D where $k = m - 1 - |L| \leq m-2$ and where the two neighbors of d_i in T_n are x_i and y_i for each $1 \leq i \leq k$. Note that the vertices x_i and y_i for $1 \leq i \leq k$ are all pairwise distinct.

Now consider the following embedding of T_n into $\overline{G}$. We begin by greedily embedding the vertices d_i to k distinct vertices in O_1 and the vertices x_i and y_i to $2k$ distinct vertices in X_1. On embedding d_i, exactly $i-1$ vertices have been embedded to O_1. Therefore $N_H = |O_1| - (i-1) = n+m-2-(i-1) \geq n+1$ vertices of O_1 have not been embedded to since $i \leq k \leq m-2$. Furthermore, exactly $2(i-1)$ vertices have been embedded to X_1 and $N_K = |X_1| - 2(i-1) = n-3m+4-2i$ vertices of X_1 have not been embedded to. Now note that since $n \geq m^2 - m + 1 \geq 10m - 18 \geq 7m - 9 - 3i$ for $m \geq 9$ because $i \leq m-3$,

$$2N_K = 2n - 6m + 8 - 4i \geq n + m - 1 - i = N_H + 1.$$

Thus by Claim 4.2 there are vertices a_i, b_i, c_i that have not been embedded to, with $a_i \in O_1$ and $b_i, c_i \in X_1$, to embed x_i, d_i, y_i to, respectively. Note that since x_i and y_i are adjacent to d_i in T_n and $d_i \in A(T_n)$, it follows that $x_i, y_i \in B(T_n)$ for all $1 \leq i \leq k$. Therefore the k vertices $d_1, d_2, \ldots, d_k$ are the vertices of $A(T_n)$ that have so far been embedded to $\overline{G}$. Since $|A(T_n)| \geq n/2$, $n \geq m^2 - m + 1 \geq 8m$ for $m \geq 9$ and $k + |L| = m - 1$, at least

$$|A(T_n)| - k - |L| \geq n/2 - m + 1 \geq 3m + 1 \geq |Y_1| + 2$$

vertices of $A(T_n)$ that are not in L have not been embedded to $\overline{G}$. Embed $|Y_1|$ of these vertices arbitrarily to Y_1, excluding t_1 and t_2 if either is in $A(T_n)$ and not in D, $\{x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_k\}$ or $\{y_1, y_2, \ldots, y_k\}$. Embed the remaining

$$n - |L| - 3k - |Y_1| = n - m + 1 - |Y_1| - 2k = |X_1| - 2k$$

vertices in $T_n - L$ arbitrarily to $X_1 - \{b_1, \ldots, b_k, c_1, \ldots, c_k\}$. Since the vertices $\{d_1, d_2, \ldots, d_k\}$ form an independent set in T_n, the vertices embedded to Y_1 are a subset of $A(T_n)$ and therefore also independent in T_n, and each vertex in X_1 is adjacent to every vertex of $X_1 \cup Y_1$ other than itself, this is a successful embedding of $T_n - L$ into $\overline{G}$.

Now note that since no $v \in D$ is adjacent to a leaf in T_n, all neighbors of L have been embedded to vertices in $X_1 \cup Y_1$. Apply the same greedy procedure as in the previous embedding to embed the leaves in L to distinct vertices in $O_1 - \{a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_k\}$ such that the embedded leaves are adjacent to their embedded neighbors in $X_1 \cup Y_1$. This is possible since $|L| + k = m - 1$ and $\overline{d_{O_1}}(u) \geq m - 1$ for all $u \in X_1 \cup Y_1$. This yields a successful embedding of T_n into $\overline{G}$. Now note that t_1 and t_2 are necessarily mapped under this embedding to vertices in X_1 and therefore are adjacent in $\overline{G}$. Thus $\overline{G}$ contains UC_n as a subgraph, which is a contradiction. □

Now define X_2, Y_2 and U_2 as in the proof of Theorem 4 with the vertex u guaranteed by Claim 4.3. Also define the set $W = V(G) - (U_1 \cup U_2)$. We next prove a claim that is a weaker analogue of Claim 3.1 for unicyclic graphs. The beginning of the proof uses ideas similar to those used in Claim 3.1.

Claim 4.4. *Each vertex $x \in V(T_n)$ adjacent to at most $2m-2$ leaves of T_n and $\Delta(T_n) < 5n/9$.*

Proof. First we show each vertex of T_n is adjacent to at most $2m-2$ leaves. Assume for the sake of contradiction that some $x \in V(T_n)$ is adjacent to at least $2m-1$ leaves. By Theorem 3, $\overline{G}$ contains S_n as a subgraph since G does not contain F_m. Let w be the center of this S_n subgraph. If $w \in U_1$, consider the following embedding of UC_n to $\overline{G}$. Note that $\overline{d_{V(G)-U_1}}(w) \geq \overline{d}(w) - (|U_1|-1) \geq n - |U_1|$. Now

map x to w, map $n - |U_1|$ leaves adjacent to x excluding t_2 to distinct vertices in $\overline{N_{V(G)-U_1}}(w)$ and map the remaining $|U_1|-1$ vertices of T_n arbitrarily to $U_1 - \{w\}$. This is possible because $2m - 2 \geq n - |U_1|$ for $m \geq 2$. Since U_1 is complete in $\overline{G}$ and both t_1 and t_2 are mapped to vertices in U_1, this embedding succeeds and yields a contradiction. Therefore we may assume that $w \notin U_1$ and, by a symmetric argument, that $w \notin U_2$. Thus we have that $w \in W$.

Now note that if $w \in W$, then since $\overline{d}(w) \geq n - 1$ and $|W| = 4m - 3$,

$$\overline{d_{U_1}}(w) + \overline{d_{U_2}}(w) \geq \overline{d}(w) - (|W| - 1) \geq n - 4m + 3.$$

Since $n - 4m + 3 \geq 7$, w is adjacent to at least four vertices of one of U_1 and U_2 in $\overline{G}$. Without loss of generality, assume w is adjacent to at least four vertices of U_1 in $\overline{G}$ with $\overline{d_{U_1}}(w) \geq 4$.

Let $C_1, C_2, \ldots, C_d$ be the connected components of the forest $T_n - x$ satisfying that either $|C_i| \geq 2$ or $t_2 \in C_i$ for each $1 \leq i \leq d$. Furthermore, let $y_1, y_2, \ldots, y_d$ denote the unique neighbors of x in $C_1, C_2, \ldots, C_d$, respectively, in T_n. Since x is adjacent to at least $2m - 2$ leaves of T_n excluding t_2, it follows that

$$|C_1 \cup C_2 \cup \cdots \cup C_d| \leq (|V(T_n)| - 1) - (2m - 2) = n - 2m + 1.$$

Furthermore, because there is at most one index i satisfying $t_2 \in C_i$ and $|C_j| \geq 2$ for all $j \neq i$, we have that

$$d \leq \frac{1}{2}(1 + |C_1 \cup C_2 \cup \cdots \cup C_d|) \leq (n - 2m + 2)/2.$$

Note that since t_1 is not a leaf, $t_1 \in C_j$ for some $1 \leq j \leq d$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $t_1, t_2 \in C_1 \cup C_2 \cup \{x\}$. Now consider the following embedding of UC_n to $\overline{G}$. Map x to w and map $y_1, y_2, \ldots, y_t$ to distinct vertices in $\overline{N_{U_1}}(w)$ where $t = \overline{d_{U_1}}(w) - 2$. Map t_1 and t_2 to two elements of $\overline{N_{U_1}}(w)$ that have not yet been embedded to, if either t_1 or t_2 has not yet been embedded. Furthermore, map $C_1 \cup C_2 \cup \cdots \cup C_t - \{y_1, y_2, \ldots, y_t\} - \{t_1, t_2\}$ to distinct vertices in U_1 that have not yet been embedded to. Note that since w is adjacent to at least four vertices of U_1 in $\overline{G}$, it follows that $t \geq 2$ and that $C_1 \cup C_2$ has been embedded to U_1. Similarly, map $y_{t+1}, y_{t+2}, \ldots, y_d$ to distinct vertices in $\overline{N_{U_2}}(w)$ and $C_{t+1} \cup C_{t+2} \cup \cdots \cup C_d - \{y_{t+1}, y_{t+2}, \ldots, y_d\}$ to distinct vertices in U_2 that have not yet been embedded to. The mapping described above is possible because

$$\begin{aligned} d \leq (n - 2m + 2)/2 \leq n - 4m + 1 \leq \overline{d_{U_1}}(w) + \overline{d_{U_2}}(w) - 2, \\ |C_1 \cup C_2 \cup \cdots \cup C_t| \leq |C_1 \cup C_2 \cup \cdots \cup C_d| \leq n - 2m + 1 < |U_1|, \\ |C_{t+1} \cup C_{t+2} \cup \cdots \cup C_d| \leq |C_1 \cup C_2 \cup \cdots \cup C_d| \leq n - 2m + 1 < |U_2|, \end{aligned}$$

since $n \geq m^2 - m + 1 \geq 6m$ for $m \geq 7$. Now embed the remaining vertices of T_n, all of which are leaves adjacent to x to distinct neighbors of w in $\overline{G}$ that have not already been embedded to. This is possible because $\overline{d}(w) \geq n - 1$. This yields a successful embedding of T_n to $\overline{G}$ since U_1 and U_2 induce complete subgraphs of $\overline{G}$. Now note that if $x \in \{t_1, t_2\}$, the other vertex of $\{t_1, t_2\}$ has been embedded to a neighbor of w in $\overline{G}$. If not, then t_1 and t_2 were both embedded to vertices of U_1. In either case, the vertices t_1 and t_2 were mapped to are adjacent in $\overline{G}$, which implies that UC_n is a subgraph of $\overline{G}$. This is a contradiction and therefore each vertex of T_n is adjacent to at most $2m - 2$ leaves.

Now we show that $\Delta(T_n) < 5n/9$. Assume for contradiction that $\Delta(T_n) \geq 5n/9$ and let x be a vertex of largest degree in T_n where $d_{T_n}(x) \geq 5n/9$. Let $K \subseteq L(T_n)$

be the set of leaves adjacent to x and let $H \subseteq V(T_n)$ be the set of vertices of degree at least two adjacent to x. It follows that $d_{T_n}(x) = |K| + |H|$ and $n = |V(T_n)| \geq 1 + |K| + 2|H|$ since T_n is a tree. Therefore we have that

$$|K| + n \geq 1 + 2|K| + 2|H| = 1 + 2d_{T_n}(u) \geq 1 + 10n/9,$$

which implies that $|K| \geq 1 + n/9 \geq 2m - 1$ since $n \geq m^2 - m + 1 \geq 18m - 18$ for $m \geq 18$. Applying the previous argument now yields a contradiction. □

We now prove a claim specializing the result in Lemma 2 as needed to account for t_1 and t_2. Claim 4.5 has no analogue in the proof of Theorem 4 and will be crucial in proving Claims 4.7 and 4.8.

Claim 4.5. *There is a vertex $x \in V(T_n)$ such that the vertices of the forest $T_n - x$ can be partitioned into two sets H and J such that there are no edges between H and J in T_n, we have the inequalities*

$$2m - 2 \leq |H|, |J| \leq n - 2m + 1 \quad \textit{and} \quad d_H(x) \leq 2m - 2$$

and one of the following holds:

(1) *$x \in \{t_1, t_2\}$;*
(2) *x is adjacent to neither t_1 nor t_2;*
(3) *$\{t_1, t_2\} \subseteq H$; or*
(4) *$\{t_1, t_2\} \subseteq J$.*

Proof. By Lemma 2, there is a vertex x of T_n such that $T_n - x$ can be partitioned into two sets P and Q such that there are no edges between P and Q and $(n - 1)/3 \leq |P|, |Q| \leq 2(n - 1)/3$. Let $C_1, C_2, \ldots, C_d$ be the connected components of the forest $T_n - x$. Since each of P and Q is a union of connected components C_i, it follows that $|C_i| \leq 2(n - 1)/3 \leq n - 2m + 1$ for all $1 \leq i \leq d$, since $n \geq m^2 - m + 1 \geq 6m - 5$ for $m \geq 6$. Furthermore, we may assume without loss of generality that $P = C_1 \cup C_2 \cup \cdots \cup C_t$ and $Q = C_{t+1} \cup C_{t+2} \cup \cdots \cup C_d$.

Let $H = C_1 \cup C_2 \cup \cdots \cup C_p$ where p is the minimum positive integer such that $|C_1| + |C_2| + \cdots + |C_p| \geq 2m - 2$. Note that since $|P| \geq (n - 1)/3 \geq 2m - 2$, it follows that $p \leq t$. Furthermore, because $|C_i| \geq 1$ for all $1 \leq i \leq d$ it follows that $d_H(x) = p \leq 2m - 2$. Set $J = C_{p+1} \cup C_{p+2} \cup \cdots \cup C_d$. For these sets H and J to not have the desired properties (1)–(4), it must hold that $x \notin \{t_1, t_2\}$, x is adjacent to at least one of t_1 and t_2 and exactly one of t_1 and t_2 is in each of H and J.

Assume that $t_1 \in C_i$ and $t_2 \in C_j$ where $1 \leq i \leq p$ and $p + 1 \leq j \leq d$. The case in which $p + 1 \leq i \leq d$ and $1 \leq j \leq p$ can be handled by a symmetric argument. If $2m - 2 \leq |C_i \cup C_j| \leq n - 2m + 1$, then setting $H = C_i \cup C_j$ and $J = V(T_n - x) - H$ yields sets satisfying the desired properties since $d_H(x) = 2$ and $m \geq 2$. Now consider the case in which $|C_i \cup C_j| < 2m - 2$. This yields the sequence of inequalities,

$$\begin{aligned} 2m - 2 &\leq |C_1| + |C_2| + \cdots + |C_p| \\ &\leq |C_1| + |C_2| + \cdots + |C_p| + |C_i| + |C_j| \\ &\leq |P| + |C_i \cup C_j| < 2(n - 1)/3 + 2m - 2 \leq n - 2m + 1 \end{aligned}$$

since $n \geq m^2 - m + 1 \geq 12m - 11$ for $m \geq 12$. Note that $C_1 \cup C_2 \cup \cdots \cup C_p \subseteq P$ since $p \leq t$. If $|C_k| = |C_l| = 1$ for some $1 \leq k < l \leq p$ then set H to be the union of

all C_q where $1 \leq q \leq p$ and $q \notin \{k, l\}$ with C_i and C_j. Also set $J = V(T_n - x) - H$. In this case, we have that since $|C_i|, |C_j| \geq |C_k| = |C_l| = 1$,

$$2m - 2 \leq |C_1| + |C_2| + \cdots + |C_p| \leq |H| \tag{4.1}$$

$$\leq |C_1| + |C_2| + \cdots + |C_p| + |C_i| + |C_j| \leq n - 2m + 1. \tag{4.2}$$

It also follows that $d_H(x) \leq p \leq 2m - 2$. Note that $d_H(x) < p$ if either i or j is at most p and not in $\{k, l\}$. This yields valid sets H and J. If no such k and l exist, set $H = C_1 \cup C_2 \cup \cdots \cup C_p \cup C_i \cup C_j$ and again set $J = V(T_n - x) - H$. Since no such k and l exist, $|C_k| = 1$ for at most one $1 \leq k \leq p$ and $|C_l| \geq 2$ for all $1 \leq l \leq p$ with $l \neq k$. Since p is the minimal p for which $|C_1| + |C_2| + \cdots + |C_p| \geq 2m - 2$, it necessarily follows that $p \leq m - 1$. Therefore we have that $d_H(x) \leq p + 2 \leq 2m - 2$. In this case, we also have exactly the sequence of inequalities (4.1) and (4.2). This again yields valid sets H and J, showing that the inequality $|C_i \cup C_j| < 2m - 2$ cannot hold.

Therefore we may assume that $|C_i \cup C_j| \geq n - 2m + 2$. We consider the case in which x is adjacent to t_1. The case in which x is adjacent to t_2 follows by a symmetric argument, because we do not use the fact that t_1 is not a leaf. Note that either $|C_i| \geq n/2 - m + 1$ or $|C_j| \geq n/2 - m + 1$. If $|C_i| \geq n/2 - m + 1$, consider the connected components of the forest $T_n - t_1$, some subset of which has as its union $C_i - \{t_1\}$. Note that $C_i \subseteq P$ since $i \leq p \leq t$. Setting H to be the smallest union of connected components of $T_n - t_1$ that are subsets of C_i satisfying that $|H| \geq 2m - 2$ and setting $J = V(T_n - t_1) - H$ yields valid sets by the same argument as in the first construction described above because

$$(n-1)/3 \leq n/2 - m \leq |C_i - \{t_1\}| \leq |P| \leq 2(n-1)/3.$$

If $|C_j| \geq n/2 - m + 1$, let y be the unique neighbor of x in C_j. Note that we may assume that $y \neq t_2$ since otherwise the construction above replacing t_1 with t_2 yields valid sets H and J. Consider the connected components of the forest $T_n - y$ and let K be the connected component of t_2. Let M be the union of $\{x\}$ and all C_q such that $q \neq j$. Note that M is a connected component of $T_n - y$ and that $t_1 \in M$. If $|K| \leq |C_j| - 2m + 2$, then set $H = M \cup K$ and $J = C_j - (\{y\} \cup K)$. Note that this implies $d_H(y) = 2$. It follows that $|H| \leq n - 2m + 1$ and that $|J| < |C_j| \leq \max\{|P|, |Q|\} \leq 2(n-1)/3 \leq n - 2m + 1$ since $n \geq m^2 - m + 1 \geq 6m - 5$ for $m \geq 6$. Note that $t_1 \in M$ and $t_2 \in K$, implying that these are valid sets H and J. Thus we may assume that $|K| \geq |C_j| - 2m + 3 \geq n/2 - 3m + 4$.

Note that y is not adjacent to t_1 since otherwise y, x and t_1 would form a triangle in T_n. Now if y is not adjacent to t_2 then y satisfies property (2). In this case, define H to be the smallest union of connected components of $T_n - y$ that are subsets of C_j satisfying that $|H| \geq 2m - 2$ and set $J = V(T_n - y) - H$, which yields valid sets using the argument above and the fact that $C_j \subseteq Q$ implies the inequalities

$$(n-1)/3 \leq n/2 - m \leq |C_j - \{y\}| \leq |Q| \leq 2(n-1)/3.$$

If y is adjacent to t_2, then consider the connected components of $T_n - t_2$. Note that there is one connected component that contains y and the others are all subsets of $K - \{t_2\}$. Let H be the smallest union of connected components of $T_n - t_2$ that are subsets of $K - \{t_2\}$ satisfying that $|H| \geq 2m - 2$ and set $J = V(T_n - t_2)$. This yields valid sets by combining the previous argument above with the inequalities

$$|K| - 1 \leq |C_j| - 1 \leq 2(n-1)/3 - 1 \leq n - 2m + 1 \quad \text{and}$$

$$|K| - 1 \geq n/2 - 3m + 3 \geq 2m - 2,$$

which hold since $n \geq m^2 - m + 1 \geq 10m - 10$ for $m \geq 10$. This completes the proof of the claim. □

We now consider the case in which there is a matching on two edges in $\overline{G}$ between U_1 and U_2. We consider the case in which this matching does not exist in Claim 4.8. The next three claims are similar to Claims 3.4, 3.5 and 3.6, they show that U_1 and U_2 induce a nearly complete bipartite subgraph of G and that each vertex in W has few neighbors in a large subset of one of U_1 or U_2.

Claim 4.6. *If there are two disjoint edges in $\overline{G}$ between U_1 and U_2, then for each $w \in U_1$ we have $\overline{d_{U_2}}(w) \leq 2m - 2$, and for each $w \in U_2$ we have $\overline{d_{U_1}}(w) \leq 2m - 2$.*

Proof. Assume for contradiction that for some $w \in U_1$, it holds that $\overline{d_{U_2}}(w) \geq 2m - 1$. Note that there is a vertex $x \in V(T_n)$ such that the vertices of the forest $T_n - x$ can be partitioned into two sets H and J satisfying the conditions described in Claim 4.5. Since there are two disjoint edges in $\overline{G}$ between U_1 and U_2, there must be some edge $yz \in E(\overline{G})$ such that $y \in U_1$, $z \in U_2$ and $y \neq w$.

Consider the case in which $x \notin \{t_1, t_2\}$ and exactly one of t_1 and t_2 is in each of the sets H and J. For now assume that $t_1 \in H$ and $t_2 \in J$. The case in which $t_1 \in J$ and $t_2 \in H$ can be handled with a symmetric argument. Claim 4.5 implies that x is adjacent to neither t_1 nor t_2 in T_n. Now consider the following embedding of UC_n into $\overline{G}$. Map x to w, t_1 to y and t_2 to z. Map the $d_H(x) \leq 2m - 2$ neighbors of x in H to distinct vertices in $\overline{N_{U_2}}(w)$ excluding y if $y \in \overline{N_{U_2}}(w)$. Note that these neighbors do not include t_2. Map the remaining $|H| - d_H(x) - 1$ vertices of H to distinct vertices in U_2 that have not already been embedded to. Since $|H| \leq n - 2m + 1 < |U_2|$, this is possible. Map $|J| - 1$ vertices of $J - \{t_1\}$ to distinct vertices in $U_1 - \{w, y\}$. This is possible because $|J| - 1 \leq n - 2m \leq |U_1| - 2$. This yields a successful embedding of T_n to $\overline{G}$ and, since $yz \in E(\overline{G})$, this also yields a successful embedding of UC_n to $\overline{G}$.

Now consider the case in which $x \in \{t_1, t_2\}$. If $\{t_1, t_2\} - \{x\}$ is in H, then map x to w, J to a subset of $U_1 - \{w\}$, the $d_H(x) \leq 2m - 2$ neighbors of x in H and $\{t_1, t_2\} - \{x\}$ to distinct vertices in $\overline{N_{U_2}}(w)$ and the remainder of H to vertices in U_2 that have not been embedded to. This embedding is valid by the same inequalities as above. Furthermore, this ensures that t_1 and t_2 are adjacent in $\overline{G}$. Similarly if $x \in \{t_1, t_2\}$ and $\{t_1, t_2\} - \{x\}$ is in J or if $\{t_1, t_2\}$ is a subset of either H or J, then this same embedding without mapping $\{t_1, t_2\} - \{x\}$ to a vertex in $\overline{N_{U_2}}(w)$ succeeds. This again yields a successful embedding of UC_n to $\overline{G}$, which is a contradiction.

A symmetric argument shows that for each $w \in U_2$ we have $\overline{d_{U_1}}(w) \leq 2m - 2$. □

Claim 4.7. *If there is an edge in $\overline{G}$ between U_1 and U_2, then for each $w \in W$ either $\overline{d_{U_1}}(w) < 1 + 5n/18$ or $\overline{d_{U_2}}(w) < 1 + 5n/18$.*

Proof. Let $yz \in E(\overline{G})$ where $y \in U_1$ and $z \in U_2$. Assume for contradiction that for some $w \in W$ it follows that $\overline{d_{U_1}}(w) \geq 1 + 5n/18$ and $\overline{d_{U_2}}(w) \geq 1 + 5n/18$. There is a vertex $x \in V(T_n)$ such that the vertices of the forest $T_n - x$ can be partitioned into two sets H and J satisfying the conditions described in Claim 4.5.

First we consider the case in which $d_J(x) \leq \overline{d_{U_2}}(w) - 1$. Note that $d_H(x) \leq 2m - 2 \leq 5n/18 \leq \overline{d_{U_1}}(w) - 1$ since $n \geq m^2 - m + 1 \geq 36(m-1)/5$ for $m \geq 8$.

Now consider the following embedding of UC_n to $\overline{G}$. Map x to w and do one of the following depending which of (1)–(4) is true from Claim 4.5:

- if $x \in \{t_1, t_2\}$ and $\{t_1, t_2\} - \{x\}$ is in H, then map $\{t_1, t_2\} - \{x\}$ to a vertex in $\overline{N_{U_1}}(w)$;
- if $x \in \{t_1, t_2\}$ and $\{t_1, t_2\} - \{x\}$ is in J, then map $\{t_1, t_2\} - \{x\}$ to a vertex in $\overline{N_{U_2}}(w)$; or
- if $x \notin \{t_1, t_2\}$ and exactly one of t_1 and t_2 is in each of H and J, then map $\{t_1, t_2\} \cap H$ to y and $\{t_1, t_2\} \cap J$ to z.

Note that in the last case, Claim 4.5 guarantees that x is adjacent to neither t_1 nor t_2. After this step, at most one vertex has been mapped to each of U_1 and U_2. Thus x has either $d_H(x)$ or $d_H(x) - 1$ neighbors in H and either $d_J(x)$ or $d_J(x) - 1$ neighbors in J that have not already been embedded to $\overline{G}$. Now map the remaining neighbors of x in H to vertices in $\overline{N_{U_1}}(w)$ that have not already been embedded to. Similarly map the neighbors of x in J to vertices in $\overline{N_{U_2}}(w)$ that have not already been embedded to. This is possible because $d_H(x) \leq \overline{d_{U_1}}(w) - 1$ and $d_J(x) \leq \overline{d_{U_2}}(w) - 1$. Map the remaining vertices in H to distinct vertices of U_1 that have not yet been embedded to and map the remaining vertices in J to distinct vertices of U_2 that have not yet been embedded to. This is possible because $|H| \leq n - 2m + 1 < |U_1|$ and $|J| \leq n - 2m + 1 < |U_2|$. Since t_1 and t_2 are either mapped to y and z, two vertices in U_1, two vertices in U_2, x and a vertex in $\overline{N_{U_1}}(w)$ or x and a vertex in $\overline{N_{U_2}}(w)$, it follows that t_1 and t_2 are adjacent in $\overline{G}$. Therefore UC_n is a subgraph of $\overline{G}$, which is a contradiction.

Now suppose that $d_J(x) \geq \overline{d_{U_2}}(w) \geq 1 + 5n/18$. Note that J is the union of $d_J(x)$ connected components of $T_n - x$, at least $d_J(x) - 2$ of which contain neither t_1 nor t_2. Let C be the union of $k = d_J(x) - \overline{d_{U_2}}(w) + 1$ of these $d_J(x) - 2$ connected components. Let $J' = J - C$ and let $H' = H \cup C$. Note that $d_{J'}(x) = \overline{d_{U_2}}(w) - 1$. It follows that $|J'| \leq |J| \leq n - 2m + 1 < |U_2|$ and that $|H'| = n - 1 - |J'| \leq n - 1 - d_{J'}(x) \leq 5n/18 - 1 < n - 2m + 2 = |U_1|$ since $13n/18 > 2m - 3$. Also note that $d_{H'}(x) = d_{T_n}(x) - d_{J'}(x) < 5n/18 \leq \overline{d_{U_1}}(w) - 1$ since $d_{T_n}(x) \leq \Delta(T_n) < 5n/9$ by Claim 4.4. Now applying the embedding described above with the sets H' and J' in place of H and J yields that UC_n is a subgraph of $\overline{G}$ and a contradiction. □

Claim 4.8. *There are subsets $U_1' \subseteq U_1$ and $U_2' \subseteq U_2$ such that $|U_1'| = |U_1| - 1$ and $|U_2'| = |U_2| - 1$ satisfying that for each $w \in W$, either $d_{U_1'}(w) \leq m - 1$ or $d_{U_2'}(w) \leq m - 1$.*

Proof. First we consider the case in which there are two disjoint edges in $\overline{G}$ between U_1 and U_2. By Claim 4.7, for each $w \in W$, either $\overline{d_{U_1}}(w) < 1 + 5n/18$ or $\overline{d_{U_2}}(w) < 1 + 5n/18$. Assume without loss of generality that $\overline{d_{U_1}}(w) < 1 + 5n/18$. If $S = N_{U_1}(w)$, then $|S| = d_{U_1}(w) > |U_1| - 5n/18 - 1$. Now assume for contradiction that $d_{U_2}(w) \geq m$ and let $x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_m \in U_2$ be m neighbors of w in U_2. By Claim 4.6, $\overline{d_{U_1}}(x_i) \leq 2m - 2$ for each $1 \leq i \leq m$ and thus

$$d_S(x_i) \geq |S| - \overline{d_{U_1}}(x_i) > |U_1| - 2m + 1 - 5n/18 \geq 13n/18 - 4m + 3 \geq m$$

for all $1 \leq i \leq m$ because $n \geq m^2 - m + 1 \geq 18(5m - 3)/13$ because $m \geq 8$. Thus there is a matching in G between $x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_m$ and a subset of size m of S. These $2m$ vertices together with w form an F_m subgraph of G, which is a contradiction. Therefore $d_{U_2}(w) \leq m - 1$. By a symmetric argument, if $\overline{d_{U_2}}(w) < 1 + 5n/18$ it

follows that $d_{U_1}(w) \leq m-1$. Now taking any size $|U_1|-1$ and $|U_2|-1$ subsets of U_1 and U_2 as U_1' and U_2', respectively, yields the claim.

Now consider the case in which there are no two disjoint edges in $\overline{G}$ between U_1 and U_2. It follows that all of the edges between U_1 and U_2 in $\overline{G}$ must be incident to a common vertex y. Without loss of generality, assume that $y \in U_1$ and let $U_1' = U_1 - \{y\}$. It follows that the parts U_1' and U_2 induce a complete bipartite subgraph of G. If $d_{U_1'}(w) \geq m$ and $d_{U_2}(w) \geq m$ for any $w \in W$, this would again yield an F_m subgraph of G centered at w. Therefore either $d_{U_1'}(w) \leq m-1$ or $d_{U_2}(w) \leq m-1$. Similarly if $y \in U_2$, then setting $U_2' = U_2 - \{y\}$ yields analogous results. Combining these cases yields the claim. □

The remainder of the proof of Theorem 5 is similar to the proof of Theorem 4 after Claim 3.6. Where details are the same, we refer to the proof of Theorem 4. Let $Z = V(G) - (X_1 \cup Y_1 \cup X_2 \cup Y_2)$ and note that $Z \subseteq W$ and $|Z| = 2m-3$. As in the proof of Theorem 4, we may assume that there is a set $Z_1 \subseteq Z$ such that $|Z_1| = m-1$ and each $w \in Z_1$ satisfies that $d_{U_1'}(w) \leq m-1$. Let $Z_1 = \{z_1, z_2, \ldots, z_{m-1}\}$. We now consider two cases.

Case 1. $|L(T_n)| \geq 2m+2$.

Using a similar procedure as in Case 1 of the proof of Theorem 4, choose D to be a set of $|D| = m-1$ leaves chosen such that $t_2 \notin D$, $d \leq m-4$ where d is the maximum value $d_D(x)$ over all $x \in V(T_n) - D$. This is possible because $|L(T_n)| \geq 2m+2$, Claim 4.4 implies that no $x \in V(T_n)$ is adjacent to more than $2m-2$ leaves and $m \geq 3$. Define d_i for $1 \leq i \leq m-1$ and y_i for $1 \leq i \leq k = |N_{T_n}(D)|$ as in the proof of Theorem 4. Since each leaf in D is adjacent to one vertex y_i and $d_D(y_j) = d$ for some j, it follows that $k \leq m-d$. Consider the following embedding of UC_n to $\overline{G}$. Begin by mapping d_i to z_i for all $1 \leq i \leq m-1$. For each $1 \leq i \leq k$, define N_i as in the proof of Theorem 4. By Claim 4.8, each z_i is not adjacent to at most $m-1$ vertices of $X_1 \cap U_1' \subseteq U_1'$ in $\overline{G}$. The number of vertices in $X_1 \cap U_1'$ adjacent to all vertices in N_i in $\overline{G}$ is at least

$$\begin{aligned} |X_1 \cap U_1'| - |N_i| \cdot (m-1) &\geq |X_1| - 1 - d(m-1) \\ &\geq (m-3-d)(m-1) \geq m-d \geq k \end{aligned}$$

where the next to last inequality follows from the fact that $1 \leq d \leq m-4$. Therefore greedily selecting k vertices $u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_k$ such that u_i is adjacent to all vertices in N_i in $\overline{G}$ and $u_i \in X_1$ for all $1 \leq i \leq k$ succeeds. As in the proof of Theorem 4, we have that

$$|A(T_n) \cap (\{y_1, y_2, \ldots, y_k\} \cup \{t_1, t_2\})| + |A(T_n) \cap D| \leq 2 + |N_1| + |N_2| + \cdots + |N_k| = m+1.$$

By Claim 3.2, since $|V(T_n - D)| = n - m + 1 = |X_1| + |Y_1|$, the forest $T_n - D$ can be embedded to $X_1 \cup Y_1$ in $\overline{G}$ such that y_i is mapped to u_i for all $1 \leq i \leq k$ and t_1 and t_2 are mapped to vertices in X_1. This yields a successful embedding of UC_n to $\overline{G}$, which is a contradiction.

Case 2. $|L(T_n)| \leq 2m+1$.

By Lemma 1, if $F = \{t_1, t_2\}$, there is a subset $K \subseteq A(T_n)$ such that $F \cap K = \emptyset$, each $w \in K$ satisfies $d_{T_n}(w) = 2$ and w is not adjacent to any leaves of T_n, no two vertices in K have a common neighbor and

$$|K| \geq \frac{1}{4}\left(n - 8|L(T_n)| + 8\right).$$

Now note that

$$|K| + |L(T_n)| \geq \frac{1}{4}(n - 4|L(T_n)| + 8) \geq \frac{1}{4}(n - 8m + 4) \geq 2m + 4$$

because $n \geq m^2 - m + 1 \geq 16m + 12$ for $m \geq 18$. Since $|L(T_n)| \leq 2m + 1$, it follows that $|K| \geq 3$. Now note that each vertex in T_n has at most one neighbor in K. Combining this with the fact that each vertex in T_n is adjacent to at most $2m - 2$ vertices in $L(T_n)$ yields, by a similar argument as in Case 2 in the proof of Theorem 4, that there is some subset $D \subseteq K \cup L(T_n)$ such that $|D| = m - 1$, it holds that $t_1, t_2 \notin D$ and $d \leq m - 5$ where d is the maximum value $d_D(x)$ over all $x \in V(T_n) - D$. This can be achieved by selecting $\min\{|K|, m - 2\} \geq 3$ vertices in K to be in D and choosing the remaining vertices from $L(T_n) - \{t_2\}$ such that at most $m - 6$ chosen leaves are adjacent to any vertex $v \in V(T_n)$.

Define d_i, y_i and N_i as in Case 1. Since each vertex in D has degree at most two and D contains at least one leaf, it follows that $k \leq 2m - 3$. As in Case 1, the number of vertices in $X_1 \cap U_1'$ adjacent to all vertices in N_i in $\overline{G}$ is at least

$$|X_1 \cap U_1'| - |N_i| \cdot (m - 1) \geq (m - 3 - d)(m - 1) \geq 2m - 3 \geq k.$$

Therefore, it again follows that greedily selecting k vertices $u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_k$ such that u_i is adjacent to all vertices in N_i in $\overline{G}$ and $u_i \in X_1$ for all $1 \leq i \leq k$ succeeds. Now note that since $K \subseteq A(T_n)$, it follows that the neighbors of vertices in $K \cap D$ are in $B(T_n)$. Thus $A(T_n) \cap \{y_1, y_2, \ldots, y_k\}$ includes only neighbors of leaves in $L(T_n) \cap D$. By the same reasoning as in Case 2 in the proof of Theorem 4,

$$|A(T_n) \cap (\{y_1, y_2, \ldots, y_k\} \cup \{t_1, t_2\})| + |A(T_n) \cap D| \leq 2 + |D| = m + 1.$$

As in the previous case, by Claim 3.2, since $|V(T_n - D)| = n - m + 1 = |X_1| + |Y_1|$, the forest $T_n - D$ can be embedded to $X_1 \cup Y_1$ in $\overline{G}$ such that y_i is mapped to u_i for all $1 \leq i \leq k$ and t_1 and t_2 are mapped to vertices in X_1. This yields a successful embedding of UC_n to $\overline{G}$, which is a contradiction. This completes the proof of Theorem 5.

5. Conclusions and Future Work

We remark that Claim 3.4 can be strengthened to show that $\overline{d_{U_2}}(w) \leq m - 2$ for each $w \in U_1$ and $\overline{d_{U_1}}(w) \leq m - 2$ for each $w \in U_2$ by adapting an argument in [12]. However, this stronger bound was not necessary for our proof of Theorem 4 and thus omitted for simplicity. Claim 4.6 can be strengthened in a similar way. Theorem 2 and Theorem 4 together show Conjecture 1 is true except for the finitely many pairs (n, m) satisfying that $6 \leq m \leq 8$ and $m^2 - m + 1 \leq n < 3m^2 - 2m - 1$. In fact, examining our proof of Theorem 4 carefully yields that Conjecture 1 has been proven to hold unless $6 \leq m \leq 8$ and $n < \min\{8m, 3m^2 - 2m - 1\}$. We also believe that a careful analysis of our method could extend our proof of Theorem 4 to the case in which $m = 8$. A direction for future work is to refine our proof of Theorem 4 to reduce the number of these pairs. Another direction for future work is to reduce the requirement $m \geq 18$ in Theorem 5, which we conjecture is true for smaller values of m.

Another possible direction for future work is to study the minimum threshold $k(n)$ such that if G is any graph with at least $k(n)$ cycles and n vertices, then $R(G, F_m) \geq 2n$ for all n. Our results show that $k(n) \geq 2$ for all n. Let C_s^t denote the graph consisting of t edge-disjoint copies of the cycle C_s that share a single

common vertex. Another direction for future work is to investigate $R(T_n, C_s^t)$ by varying t, n or both. The general case appears to be difficult but examining this value for C_4^t with small or potentially all values of t may be reasonable.

Acknowledgements

This research was conducted at the University of Minnesota Duluth REU and was supported by NSF grant 1358695 and NSA grant H98230-13-1-0273. The author thanks Joe Gallian for suggesting the problem and Benjamin Gunby and Joe Gallian for helpful comments on the manuscript.

References

[1] S.A. Burr, Ramsey numbers involving graphs with long suspended paths, J. London Math. Soc. **2** (1981), no. 3, 405-413.
[2] S.A. Burr, P. Erdős, R.J. Faudree, C.C. Rousseau, and R.H. Schelp, Ramsey numbers for the pair sparse graph-path or cycle, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **269** (1982), no. 2, 501-512.
[3] V. Chvátal, Tree-complete graph Ramsey numbers, J. Graph Theory **1** (1977), no. 1, 93-93.
[4] V. Chvátal and F. Harary, Generalized Ramsey theory for graphs. II. small diagonal numbers, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **32** (1972), no. 2, 389-394.
[5] V. Chvátal and F. Harary, Generalized Ramsey theory for graphs. III. small off-diagonal numbers, Pacific J. Math. **41** (1972), no. 2, 335-345.
[6] V. Chvátal and F. Harary, Generalized Ramsey theory for graphs. I. diagonal numbers, Periodica Math. Hungarica **3** (1973), no. 1-2, 115-124.
[7] L. Droogendijk, Graph with cycles of every length, Math. Stack Exchange, v. Feb. 20, 2015.
[8] Y. Li and C.C. Rousseau, Fan-complete graph Ramsey numbers, J. Graph Theory **23** (1996), no. 4, 413-420.
[9] S.P. Radziszowski, Small Ramsey numbers, Electron. J. Combin. Dynamic Surveys DS1, Revision 14 (2014).
[10] A.N.M. Salman and H. Broersma, Path-fan Ramsey numbers, Discrete Applied Math. **154** (2006), no. 9, 1429-1436.
[11] L. Shi, Ramsey numbers of long cycles versus books or wheels, European J. Combin. **31** (2010), no. 3, 828-838.
[12] Y. Zhang, H. Broersma, and Y. Chen, Ramsey numbers of trees versus fans, Discrete Math. **338** (2015), no. 6, 994-999.

Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA 02139
E-mail address: brennanm@mit.edu